DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 986 UD 021 039

AUTHOR McConahay, John B.
TITLE Racial and Non-Racial Correlates of Anti-Busing Attitudes in Louisville.
INSTITUTION Duke Univ., Durham, N.C.
SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Louisville Foundation, Ky.
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 41p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Busing; *Community Attitudes; Elementary Secondary Education; *Public Opinion; *Racial Attitudes; Racial Bias; *School Desegregation
IDENTIFIERS *Kentucky (Jefferson County)

ABSTRACT

The relative strength of racial and nonracial factors in motivating the public's opinion about busing has both theoretical and policy implications. If nonracial, especially self interest, factors are the strongest motives for opposition, then the success of busing, and of school desegregation in general, will depend upon the ability of the American political process to ameliorate the personal, social class, and educational aims of the contending parties. If opposition is rooted in racial or political attitudes, then attempts to adjust the self interest claims of the contending parties will be ineffective, leaving opposition to busing undiminished. This paper describes the results of a public opinion study conducted in Louisville, Kentucky, at the end of the first year of county wide court ordered desegregation. The study examined the correlates of anti-busing attitudes with both racial and nonracial factors. It was found that neighborhood ties, perception of one's own neighborhood schools as superior to others, having children in the public schools, and having children who were bused, were all insignificant in predicting opposition to busing. Racism, however, as demonstrated by the beliefs that discrimination no longer exists, that blacks are making unfair demands and gains, and being accorded undue recognition and respect, was a significant predictor of anti-busing sentiment. (Author/GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

OCT 6 - 1980

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY John B. McConahay

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED196986

WD021039

RACIAL AND NON-RACIAL CORRELATES OF ANTI-BUSING ATTITUDES IN LOUISVILLE

John B. McConahay[1]

Duke University

> Busing seems not the way to achieve what we are after and ought to be dropped. The best argument against it was given by a neighbor: "You forget, Michener, that when we came to school on the trolley car we were coming to a <u>better</u> school. So that any expense of time or money was justified. But if you bus our children into Philadelphia, they will be going to a worse school. And for that there can be no justification."
>
> James A. Michener[2]

> The real issue isn't education. The real issue is Niggers!
>
> David Dukes, Grand Dragon of the Ku Klux Klan addressing a rally in South Boston.[3]

In the current controversy over the use of school buses to desegregate the public schools of America, most opponents of busing (David Dukes notably excepted) have taken great pains to justify their positions on non-racial grounds. Both popular[4] and scholarly[5] opponents have emphasized that busing harms education, causes great inconvenience and suffering to students and their parents and violates the integrity of the local neighborhood. Advocates of busing for desegregation, while not ignoring educational and other non-racial issues, have generally charged that much of the opposition was rooted in racism.[6]

The relative strengths of racial and non-racial factors in motivating the public's opposition to busing has implications for scholarly theories

of mass political attitudes and behavior,[7] but it also has policy implications. If non-racial, especially self-interest factors, are the strongest motives for opposition, then the success of busing and school desegregation in general will hinge upon the ability of the American political process to ameliorate the personal, social class and educational claims of the contending parties. For example, the government might compensate persons for any decline in their property values. Or, school administrators might tinker with bus schedules to make them more convenient. Or they might improve the quality of education in certain schools in order to reduce the discrepancies between previously all white and all black schools. However, if opposition to busing is rooted in racial attitudes and/or other values acquired during political socialization, then attempting to adjust the self-interest claims of the contending parties (no matter how worthwhile this would be in its own right) will miss the mark and leave the opposition to busing undiminished. Under these circumstances, busing or other means of school desegregation will need to be described to the public in a fashion that does not offend certain deeply held values while emphasizing that it will optimize other equally cherished values. That is, the symbol manipulation role of political leaders will take on crucial importance.[8]

My purpose here is to shed some light upon the racial versus non-racial aspect of the busing issue. I shall report the results of the analysis of public opinion research in Louisville, Kentucky, while the busing controversy was very intense there. The analysis examined the correlates of anti-busing attitudes and such non-racial factors as the degree of personal self-interest in the outcome of the controversy and concerns about education. The analysis of the role of racial attitudes included both the traditional measures of

anti-black attitudes or old fashioned racism and a new set of racial opinions which my colleagues and I have called symbolic racism.[9]

Previous public opinion research on the busing issue has been sparse and of only limited value. Since it has been reviewed in detail elsewhere, I will simply summarize it here.[10] First, most of the studies did not have adequate or appropriate samples. Second, all but one examined only racial factors or only non-racial factors as correlates of busing opposition. Third, the one study that analyzed the relative strengths of both found strong racial effects and negligible self-interest effects.[11] However, this study used a national sample and, thus, very few respondents appeared in it who were directly affected by busing. This would limit the likelihood of finding self-interest effects.

The data reported below, came from a random sample of adults living in Louisville and surrounding Jefferson County at the end of the first year of court ordered, countywide school desegregation. This study differs from previous research in that it has a sizable random sample, which was drawn in a locality where busing was already in effect, tested the relative strengths of both racial and non-racial factors in the same analysis and used a scale of strength of opposition to busing that had both greater reliability and greater variance than previous studies.

The Local Context:

Busing for desegregation came to Louisville in the fall of 1975. In the preceding summer, Judge Gordon issued an order combining the city and county school systems and mandating busing to achieve desegregation. The unified school system implemented a plan that used busing to create schools that were no less than 14 percent black and no more than 18 percent black. There

were some schools that were as much as 24 percent black, but these were "walk-in" schools situated in desegregated neighborhoods. The total school population was 20 percent black at that time and previously there had been a number of all white and all black schools. For both whites and blacks, busing or walking was on the basis of a quasi-random assignment. Whites were to be bused one or two out of their twelve years in school. The exact number and the specific year was a joint function of grade and first letter of last name. Blacks were to be bused for 9 of their 12 years, again on the basis of grade and last initial. Despite the fact that the major burden of the busing fell upon the black students and the ratio of blacks to whites in any school approximated the desegregation mix that previous research had shown that whites -- North and South -- found most acceptable,[12] the white community reacted with a fury that attracted national attention.

Starting in August, 1975, there were protests, demonstrations, sit-ins, fire-bombings, boycotts and other acts of resistance. The survey reported here was taken in the spring of 1976 when most of the violence had died down, but while the non-violent protests were continuing. It was the first of two independent waves of adult interviews. The second (not reported here) was completed in the summer of 1977. Also interviewed, but not yet analyzed were samples of community leaders and of children who were in the public schools in 1975-76 and 1976-77.[13]

Attitudes Toward Segregation and Busing:

Busing and school desegregation were salient issues to the black and white citizens of Louisville. In response to our first question, "What do you think are the most important problems facing Louisville and Jefferson County today? Any others?", the most frequent response (70 percent) mentioned

busing explicitly and 76 percent of the respondents mentioned at least one problem having to do with busing and school desegregation. Our respondents also thought crime (28%) and the local economy (24%) presented problems, but these lagged far behind busing and desegregation.

Though Louisville is in a border state that is more southern than northern in culture, segregationist sentiment was not rampant there.[14] When asked if they preferred full integration, segregation or something in between (see Table 1 for exact wording), only 16 percent of the whites opted for full separation.[15] Furthermore, when asked a rather "hard" version of a school desegregation question,[16] a majority of the whites responded that they thought proportional representation of the races in each school was a good idea (see Table 1). Black respondents were even more in favor of the idea, but a majority of whites favored it nevertheless. It should be noted that the wording of this item reflected the condition that existed in Louisville as a result of the busing plan in effect in 1975-1976. Every school approximated the racial composition of the school population as a whole. However, the question did not have any emotionally loaded symbols such as "busing" or "desegregation."

- - - - - - - -

Insert Table 1 about here

- - - - - - - -

When these terms were introduced, however, the whites in Louisville exhibited the same reversal noted in national samples by other researchers.[17] They favored desegregation, but they did not want busing. As shown in Table 1, 76 percent of the whites were strongly opposed.[18] Blacks tended to favor the plan, but were not as nearly unanimous in their support as whites were in their opposition.

Whites not only rejected the current busing plan, but also rejected the notion of busing in general, fully 53 percent of white respondents opposed the plan and could think of no modification in the plan that would make it acceptable to them. (See Table 1.)

Furthermore, 20 percent of the whites indicated that they would engage in protests and demonstrations against it if the busing plan were continued the next year, as shown in Table 1. However, this response should be considered more as an indication of the depth of their feelings than as a promise of things to come. Nothing approaching that percentage turned out to protest during the 1976-77 school year. If they had, Louisville officials would have had quite a problem on their hands. Twenty percent is larger than the 15 percent of the Watts population that participated in the 1965 uprising there.[19]

In order to increase the reliability of our analyses, a scale of Strength of Opposition to Busing was created by combining responses to the last three busing questions shown in Table 1. The details of scale construction are reported elsewhere.[20] The scale had a high level of reliability and it was the dependent variable for all subsequent analyses reported here.[21] For illustrative purposes, cross-tabulations between a representative item from the scale and certain correlates of the scale that proved to be important on the basis of multiple regression analysis are also reported. The representative item chosen was the question regarding the acceptability of busing if modifications were made in the plan. (This is the next to last question shown in Table 1.) This item was dichotomized into two categories: the adamant opponents and all other positions. The adamant opponents of busing were those who rejected the plan in all cases while the other category

included those who were in favor of busing, or who were opposed, but would accept it with modifications in the plan or who were not sure of their position on the issue.

Self-Interest and Personal Convenience:

Many opponents of busing argue that their opposition and that of others is based upon personal self-interest or their concern for the self-interest and personal convenience of other whites.[22] For a person to have a self-interest in the outcome of a political or social controversy, the outcome should have a direct economic or physical comfort and convenience effect upon the person or his or her immediate family. (We shall consider class interests and other indirect interests below.) A person's self-interest can increase or decrease depending upon the issue and upon how directly the person is affected financially or physically. With respect to the busing issue, it is the children who would be bused or their parents who have the most direct self-interest. It is they who have to get up earlier to catch the bus, provide extra money for lunch if the students had walked home for lunch previously and so forth. Adults without children, who rent their houses and have few ties to the neighborhood or community should have the least direct self-interest. Any financial or convenience effects upon them would be minimal and indirect, perhaps the marginal increment in their rent attributable to the marginal increment in the landlord's taxes due to the marginal increment in transportation costs.

Hence, if opposition to busing is motivated strongly by self-interest, measures of self-interest and convenience ought to be related to our Strength of Opposition to Busing scale in predictable ways: those who have the most to lose, who are most inconvenienced, or who are most seriously and personally

affected by busing ought to be most opposed. As shown in Table 2, this happened in many cases, but the associations were weak.[23]

Children in School. Presumably, one of the groups of whites with the most self-interest ought to be parents with children in school. Parents of public school students should be the most affected because their children would attend the newly desegregated schools either on buses or on foot to schools receiving black students. However, parents of private or parochial school students should also have greater self-interest than non-parents since the increased demand for spaces in private and parochial schools might drive-up tuition costs or if these parents suffered financial reversals they might have to send their youngsters to the public schools. Hence, if concern for their children's safety or the quality of their education were a powerful factor motivating opposition to busing, we might expect parents to be more opposed than non-parents.

As shown in Table 2, this was somewhat the case. Parents of school children were slightly more opposed than non-parents. The zero order correlation (the correlation with no controls for other factors) was +.11. However, this relationship accounted for only slightly more than one percent of the variance in opposition to busing and, as we shall see, this relationship was reduced to zero when other factors were controlled. A further illustration of the similarity on this issues of those with school age children to those without is provided by responses to the question on modifications in the busing plan. Fifty-four percent of those with children and 52% of those without children were opposed to busing no matter what changes might be made, a trivial difference.

- - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 2 about here

- - - - - - - - - -

Relative Quality and Importance of Neighborhood Schools. Another measure of self-interest we tested was the relative quality of the schools in the neighborhood. Parents ought to be most concerned with the quality of the local school, but non-parents have a self-interest here as well because the quality of the neighborhood schools could affect the resale value of homes. Hence, people perceiving that their neighborhood schools were inferior to others in Louisville and Jefferson County should favor busing because it could potentially improve the educational opportunities of youngsters bused to better schools and those perceiving that their neighborhood schools were superior should be opposed.[24]

It did not seem to turn out that way in Louisville, however. As shown in Table 2. those who perceived that their neighborhood schools were better than others were less opposed than those who perceived their schools to be worse than schools elsewhere! Again, though, the relationship was weak and it reduced even more when controls were applied.

It has also been argued in the popular media that opposition to busing is rooted in the destruction of the neighborhood school as a social and recreational center for local community.[25] However, the perceived social and recreational importance of the local school was not at all related to strength of opposition to busing (r = .00, see Table 2).

Neighborhood Ties. Opposition to busing has been popularly explained as a perceived invasion of community territory or of local turf. Persons who own as opposed to rent their homes, those who have a great many relatives

in the area, who have lived there a long time and who are not likely to be moving elsewhere soon, in short those with strong ties to the neighborhood, have a self-interest in maintaining the cultural and social stability of the neighborhood and therefore ought to be more opposed to busing than those with fewer ties to the territory.

As shown in Table 2, these measures of self-interest produced mixed, but uniformly weak relationships. Length of residence and home ownership were related to strength of opposition to busing in the way that self interest would predict, but general happiness with the neighborhood was in the opposite direction and the number of relatives and likelihood of moving were not significantly related at all.

The Best Equation. In order to estimate the overall strength of the measures of self-interest and to determine the "statistically best" predictors of anti-busing attitudes, a stepwise multiple regression was performed using the variables shown in Table 2 as predictors.[26] The standardized regression coefficients (or Beta weights) for the best equation using self-interest factors as predictors are shown in Table 2. These coefficients may be regarded as a form of partial correlation between the given predictor and anti-busing attitudes with the other variables in the equation controlled.[27] For measures of self-interest, the best predictor variables were having children in school, relative ratings of neighborhood schools and length of residence in the neighborhood. However, the predictive power (R^2) for this equation could account for only three precent of the variance on the Strength of Opposition to Busing scale. And the R^2 from the multiple regression equation including all measures of self-interest shown in Table 2 was equally dismal.

Self-Interest Among Parents:

As a further test of the self-interest and convenience hypothesis, a separate analysis using only white parents with children in school was performed. All parents would have some self-interest but their self-interest, concerns, fears, and convenience might be increased by such factors as the number of children they have in school, their ratings of their neighborhood schools, or the number of girls or boys they have.

Public Versus Private Schools. One of the most important of these factors would be the type of school the children attended. A number of elite commentators from both the left[28] and right[29] wings of the political spectrum and countless speakers at grass-roots anti-busing rallies in Louisville, Boston, Los Angeles, and elsewhere have pointed out that many prominent pro-busing advocates have their children in private or parochial schools and, hence, can afford to be for busing for other people's children. We might, therefore, expect those whose children were in private or parochial schools to be less opposed to busing than public school parents whose children were bused.

This did not prove to be the case, however. As shown in Table 3, the type of school attended was not significantly correlated with anti-busing attitudes. Parental opposition was not affected by (nor did it affect) the type of schools attended by their children.[30]

- - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 3 about here

- - - - - - - - -

Bused and Not Bused. It was indicated above that the parents of students who rode the bus (and their children) were the persons in the community who would be most affected and inconvenienced by the busing program. If personal

self-interest and convenience were factors in motivating opposition to busing, then certainly the parents of bused students ought to be more opposed than other parents. Once again, however, the relationship did not materialize. As shown in Table 3, the correlation between the extent of busing in the family and opposition to busing was .00! Those parents whose children were bused and those whose children walked to the same school they would have attended without a busing or desegregation plan were equally opposed to busing.

Because the present author knows from personal experience that maximum inconvenience occurs when some of the children in a family are bused and others are not, the relationship between the strength of opposition to busing scale and the extent of busing in the family was analyzed further by means of a one way analysis of variance, a procedure that will pick up a difference among the three types of families (all bused, some bused and some not, none bused) regardless of which group is the most opposed. Again, the relationship was not significant.[31] A final illustration of how weak and contradictory the evidence is for the notion that opposition to busing draws its strength from the parents whose children are being bused is provided by responses to the question about the acceptability of busing with modifications in the extant plan. Those with children who were being bused were slightly less adamant about their opposition than those upon whom busing had no direct impact at all: adults who had no school age children. Forty nine percent of the parents of bused students were opposed to busing no matter how the plan might be modified and 52% of the nonparents were adamantly opposed.

Other Parental Self-Interest Measures. Of the 15 measures of parental self-interest examined, only three had statistically significant zero order correlations: the likelihood of moving in the next 12 months, the relative

rating of neighborhood schools and the age of the oldest child in school. One of these was in the direction that a self-interest or personal concern hypothesis might predict: the younger the oldest child the more opposed the parent was to busing. But, again, the relationship was a weak one accounting for about one percent of the variance.

The relationship of strength of opposition to busing to relative rating of neighborhood schools was in the opposite direction from what a self-interest hypothesis would predict: the better parents rated their neighborhood schools relative to other city schools, the less they were opposed to busing!

The meaning placed upon the third significant relationship depends upon how one interprets the parents' likelihood of moving in the next few months. If a high likelihood is seen as reflecting few or no ties to the neighborhood, then those with the least self-interest in the neighborhood were most opposed to busing which is the opposite of what the self-interest or a territoriality hypothesis would predict. On the other hand, it may reflect white flight: those who were most opposed were most likely to contemplate moving. The relationship was weak, nevertheless, accounting for slightly more than two percent of the variance in opposition to busing.

The Best Equation. The best equation for parents (using the criteria defined above) included only two terms (likelihood of moving and relative rating of schools) and had an R^2 of .04. With all 15 measures in the equation the R^2 was only .06 and the Multiple R was not significant. Hence, individually and collectively, measures of direct self-interest and convenience did not have much of a relationship with anti-busing attitudes in either the citizenry as a whole or in the more limited domain of parents of school age children.

Social Location:

We turn now to consider another non-racial factor in which the self-interest of whites may be less direct, but still potentially important: location in the social structure. Two aspects of social location must be considered, the individual's current social class or status and his or her social background. It could be that the relationships reported in Tables 2 and 3 were so weak or ran counter to what might be expected on the basis of direct self-interest and personal consequences because social class or some other social structure factor was masking or suppressing the relationships.

Current social location is also potentially an important correlate of anti-busing attitudes because some measures of social location such as type of occupation or income are also measures of self-interest. Blue collar workers of the two races are frequently in competition for jobs and some of the most vocal opposition to busing in Louisville came from the white dominated blue collar labor unions. Blue collar workers have been prominent in anti-busing demonstrations in Louisville, Boston and elsewhere prompting one political organizer to comment: "Instead of pushing for a bigger share of society's wealth, people are fighting over the leavings."[32]

Closely related to social location and also important for our analysis of the attitudinal antecendents of opposition to busing is the social class background or socialization of the respondent. The level of education received, for example, both influences how people think about political and racial issues and places a person in America's status hierarchy. Other measures of socialization, such as the region of the country where one was reared, are less correlated with class or status than education but are

highly correlated with racial attitudes.[33] Both social location and socialization must, therefore, be considered in a complete model of anti-busing attitudes.

Current Social Location. The relationships of anti-busing attitudes with measures of current social location are summarized in Table 4. After a factor analysis revealed that the measures could not be combined profitably, the usual multiple regression procedure was performed using the measures in Table 4. All but the two employment status variables were significantly related to strength of opposition to busing and had significant independent effects in the best equation. The results were not particularly strong, nor were they generally surprising: persons in households headed by blue collar workers, home owners, lower income persons, union members, and males tended to oppose busing more than others. The R^2 for the best regression equation was .07. Though that was roughly twice the R^2 for self-interest, current social location was not a very strong predictor of opposition to busing.

- - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 4 about here

- - - - - - - - - -

Prior Socialization. Our measures of previous socialization are summarized in Table 5. Education and region of socialization before age 13 proved to be the stongest correlates of strength of opposition to busing in this set. The lesser educated and those reared in the south were more opposed to busing than others. For education, the difference among levels was greater than for any variable reported so far. Sixty eight percent of those with an eighth grade education or less were adamantly opposed to busing while only 29% of those with graduate and professional school training were so

opposed. The R^2 for the best equation for current social location was .07.

- - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 5 about here

- - - - - - - - - -

Social Location and Socialization Combined. When all of the variables in Tables 4 and 5 were run in one stepwise, best predictor criterion multiple regression, the R^2 was .10 and it had only four significant terms: education (Beta = -.24), union membership in the family (.10), home ownership (.10) and region of socialization (-.09). Thus, while measures of current social location and previous socialization, individually and collectively, were stronger correlates of strength of opposition to busing than measures of direct self-interest, they could at best account for about 10% of the variance in anti-busing attitudes.[34]

Political Attitudes:

The controversy over busing in Louisville and elsewhere is a political issue, of course. Other researchers have found that anti-busing attitudes were related to measures of political conservatism.[35] In addition, a number of popular analyses have argued that opposition to busing stems from (white) people's resentment about government interference in their lives.[36] The implication of these arguments is that opposition to busing is a backlash, born in feelings of political impotence, against the government's and especially the courts' departure from the laissez-faire doctrine of government.[37] Because of space and time limitation, our survey could not explore all aspects of political feelings and attitudes. We did include some questions designed to tap different aspects of political conservatism and feelings of political powerlessness. These items are shown in Table 6.

- - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 6 about here

- - - - - - - - - -

Though many of these items appeared to fall on a common left-right or liberal to conservative dimension, a factor analysis failed to find it. Hence, we treated each item individually in the multiple regression procedure. These results are summarized in Table 6. It can be seen there that our measure of laissez-faire attitude toward government (disagreement with: "It is up to the government to make sure that everyone has a secure job and a good standard of living.") was essentially uncorrelated with anti-busing attitudes. For example, 51% of those disagreeing with the statement were adamantly opposed to the busing plan while 54% of those who agreed were also adamantly opposed.[38]

Our measure of political powerlessness was a somewhat better predictor of opposition to busing. As shown in Table 6, agreement with the statement that "People like me don't have any say about what the government does" was correlated .21 with the strength of opposition to busing scale and entered the best regression equation for this set of measures. Those feeling politically powerless were more likely to be adamantly opposed to busing (58%) than those feeling that they do have a say in governmental actions (43%).

The Best Equation. The best equation for the measures of political attitudes had an R^2 of .11 and four significant terms of about the same strength of association with oppositon to busing as measured by their respective Betas. One of these terms was the political powerlessness item and the other three were measures of different aspects of life style conservatism (sex education) and law and order conservatism (unsafe streets and the death

penalty). Though the conservatism items tap distinct dimensions, the relationships were in the same direction: the more conservative, the more anti-busing. However, the conservatism that related to anti-busing was not of the laissez-faire type. It had much more of a racial overtone to it than many opponents of busing would like to admit.[39] Notably absent from the best political attitudes equation was strength of party affiliation. Opposition to busing in Louisville cut across party lines.

Personal and Fraternal Discontents and Deprivations:

Though the analyses will be reported upon in detail elsewhere, measures of relative deprivation were considered as potential correlates of anti-busing attitudes.[40] The deprivations were either relative to a reference group (blacks, lawyers, educational experts, other whites) or to an absolute standard and the subject of the deprivation was either personal or fraternal (my race, my neighbors). Furthermore, two dimensions of evaluation were used: economic and influence on school decisions. In the final analysis (see below), one of these proved to be important, but most did not.

Racial Attitudes:

The analysis has proceeded in stages from obviously non-racial factors (having children, having them bused) through factors that have had progressively more pronounced racial overtones (region of the country where respondent was reared, law and order conservatism). Though the change has not been linear, at each step the strength of the correlation with opposition to busing has increased. Now, directly racial factors will be considered.

In doing so, a distinction will be made between two types of racial attitudes and opinions: old fashioned and symbolic racism. Old fashioned racism is the cognitive component of racism from years gone by, the belief

in the stereotypes that black people are lazy or dumb, and that it is justifiable to exclude them from schools, jobs and personal relationships. Most Americans recognize old fashioned racism. It is the racism of Bull Conner, George Wallace and the Klan. Symbolic or new racism is not so easy for many Americans to spot. It is the belief that blacks are not playing fair and that they are making illegitimate demands for changes in the racial status quo. It is expressed not in stereotypes and support for segregation, but in abstract, moralistic, ideological symbols: blacks are getting more than they deserve, the media and government show them too much respect, black anger is unjustified, discrimination no longer exists.

Data showing that old fashioned and symbolic racism rest upon the same negative feelings and that measures of symbolic racism predict racially relevent behavior have been presented elsewhere.[41] Here, the relationship between the two types of racism and anti-busing attitudes will be analyzed.

The Louisville survey instrument contained items designed to assess positions on both dimensions of racism. Old fashioned racism was measured by questions assessing support for segregation (see Table 1 for examples), negative stereotypes, social distance and the legitimacy of discrimination.[42] Symbolic racism was assessed by a scale containing items such as "Over the past few years blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve" (strongly or somewhat agree was regarded as the racist response) and "It is easy to understand the anger of black people in America" (strongly or somewhat disagree was regarded as the racist response).[43]

Symbolic versus Old Fashioned Racism. Symbolic racism correlated .51 with the strength of opposition to busing scale and old fashioned racism correlated .36, as shown in Table 7. These were the two largest bivariate

correlations with anti-busing attitudes in the entire data set. As racism increased, opposition to busing increased dramatically in both instances. For example, 22% of those low in symbolic racism were adamantly opposed to busing while 81% of those high in symbolic racism were so opposed.[44] Furthermore as predicted, symbolic racism had a much closer relationship to strength of opposition to busing than did old fashioned racism. Not only did symbolic racism have a higher zero order correlation with anti-busing to begin with, but with old fashioned racism controlled, the relationship was not greatly reduced (partial r = .45). On the other hand, with symbolic racism controlled, the already lower correlation between old fashioned racism and anti-busing attitudes was reduced considerably more (partial r = .10). Old fashioned racism was a factor in opposition to busing in Louisville, but it was not nearly the factor that symbolic racism was.

- - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 7 about here

- - - - - - - - - -

Other Measures of Racial Attitudes. There were three other measures of racial attitudes used in this analysis. One of these was a "feeling thermometer" (ranging from warm feelings to cold feelings toward blacks). This scale has been used by others as a measure of favorable or unfavorable feelings or affect toward black people in general.[45] While its correlation with anti-busing attitudes was rather weak (-.16), it was still a stronger correlate than any of the measures of personal self-interest and convenience used in this study. The other two measures were the respondents' estimates of the amount of social contact they had with blacks and their estimates of the amount of contact of any sort that they had. Both measures were not significantly

correlated with opposition to busing. The low correlations for these contact measures was fairly strong evidence that strength of opposition to busing, whatever its true source, did not grow out of personal experience with blacks. Those with very little and those with a great deal of personal contact and experience were equally opposed to busing.

The Best Equation. As shown in Table 7, the only variable to enter the best multiple regression equation was symbolic racism (Beta = .52). Notably missing from this equation is old fashioned racism which did not increase the R^2 by one percent or more with symbolic racism in the equation.[46] The R^2 for this equation was .26. This was the largest R^2 for any subset of variables examined and it was almost nine times as large as the R^2 for the best equation for personal self-interest.

A More Complete Model of Opposition to Busing:

Though racial attitudes by themselves, especially symbolic racism, were the strongest correlates of anti-busing attitudes, it was entirely possible that the effects of racism would be severely diminished when controls for other correlates of busing opposition were introduced. Therefore, a more complete mathematical model had to be developed that included and controlled for the most likely predictors. Such a model would be the best estimate of the social and attitudinal sources of opposition to busing in Louisville.

The same stepwise multiple regression procedure used above was employed to construct this model. The potencial prediction terms were the variables comprising the best prediction equations for the subsets of factors previously analyzed (self-interest, social location, racism, and so forth) plus three variables that were theoretically important though they had previously not made it into the "best prediction" equations: the old fashioned racism scale,

a measure of "authoritarianism"[47] and the respondents' subjective estimates of their own social class. This made 28 potential terms in the final equation. The best model developed by this procedure is summarized in Table 8.

- - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 8 about here

- - - - - - - - -

The Best Equation. There were five terms in the best prediction equation. These were symbolic racism, satisfaction with personal influence on school desegregation decisions, southern socialization, living in a household headed by a blue collar worker and endorsement of the crime in the streets ideology. Of these five, symbolic racism was definitely the strongest factor. It had the highest zero order correlation with anti-busing attitudes in the data set, had the highest standardized regression coefficient in the final equation and adding the other four terms to the equation only increased its predictive power by five percent over what was predicted by symbolic racism by itself. Opposition to busing in Louisville in the spring of 1976 was firmly grounded in this new form of racism.

Though weaker than symbolic racism, the second term in the best prediction equation was a measure of the respondents' satisfaction with their own influence on school desegregation decisions. Satisfaction was assessed by asking respondents to rate their perceptions of the influence exerted on school desegregation decision by a number of groups and individuals including blacks, whites, lawyers and themselves on a scale running from "much more influence than entitled to" through "the right amount" to "much less influence than entitled to."[48] Very few people (4%) rated themselves as having more influence than they were entitled to have so that ratings on this item

generally ran from respondents who thought they had the "right amount" to those who thought they had "much less" than they were entitled to have. Though it was not as strong a correlate as symbolic racism and the direction of causation is ambiguous, with other factors controlled those who thought they had less influence on school desegregation than they should have were more opposed to busing than those who thought they had the right amount.

The other three terms in the best prediction equation were quite weak, though statistically significant. Each one barely added one percent to the equation's predictive power. Furthermore, with other potential predictors added to the equation (hence controlling statistically for their influence), the correlation between opposition to busing and occupation of the head of the household did not differ significantly from zero. To the extent that they were correlated with anti-busing attitudes after controlling for racism, it is likely that southern socialization and being a member of a blue collar family represent the residual effects of reference group influence. In Louisville, southerners and blue collar workers were so overwhelmingly opposed to busing that some members of those groups would be opposed independently of any personal prejudice (by our measures) because everyone else they knew was opposed.

The last variable in the best equation was an abstract, ideological question about crime in the streets. This item has been so closely associated with symbolic racism in other studies, that it has been used as a surrogate for it in studies wishing to avoid items worded with direct racial content.[49] It was intended as a symbolic racism item in this study, but when an item analysis showed that it was only weakly related to the other scale items, it was used separately as an indicator of conservative, crime in the streets

ideology.

Alternative Models and Controls. A number of alternative models were tested and the most important of these are reported in detail elsewhere.[50] These analyses did not alter the findings reported here. In the right hand column of Table 8, the results of controlling for 21 of the 25 other potential predictors in the stepwise multiple regressions are summarized.[51] As can be seen there, symbolic racism remained the strongest and most important correlate while the already weak effect of occupation was reduced to zero. Hence, with controls for social class, personal self-interest, political beliefs and relative deprivation and other discontents; those most likely to be opposed to busing in Louisville in 1976 were persons high in symbolic racism and those not satisfied with their influence on school desegregation decision, southerners and law and order conservatives.

Conclusion:

Busing is a racial issue. Given the differences between the two races in Louisville on the issue (see Table 1), one could hardly expect it to be otherwise. Nevertheless, so many white opponents have insisted that the issue was quality education or the costs to parents and students that the findings reported here are instructive. In the final analysis, having ties to the neighborhood, perceiving that your neighborhood schools were superior to others, having children in the public schools, even having children who were bused were insignificant in predicting opposition to busing. Racism was the big factor.

But it is not old fashioned racism that gives anti-busing attitudes their strength and prevalence. Certainly, white people who think blacks are dumb and who oppose any form of integration are opposed to busing. However,

some people who do not hold these positions also oppose busing and their presence in the ranks of opponents clouds the issue. Americans recognize old fashioned racism, but they are not so perceptive when it comes to other forms of racism.

The wide spread opposition to busing in Louisville (and elsewhere) is rooted in a new form of racism, symbolic racism. This is the belief that discrimination no longer exists, that blacks are making unfair demands and illegitimate gains and that powerful persons and institutions in the nation are giving blacks undue recognition and respect. These beliefs are not seen as racism by many white Americans but they rest on the same negative feelings as old fashioned racism.[52] And, the two are equally able to predict racially relevant interpersonal behaviors.[53] In other words, persons high in symbolic racism have the same negative feelings toward blacks as persons high in old fashioned racism and they behave toward blacks in similar ways. Symbolic racism, however, is not perceived as racism while old fashioned racism is. Thus, the debate over busing rages on with opponents unable to recognize their racism and supporters sensing that racism is part of the debate but unable to identify it clearly. Both are mislead because they have old fashioned racism in mind.

Opposition to busing is, in fact, an aspect of symbolic racism. Little white children getting on buses to ride out of their neighborhoods to school is another symbol of the unfair demands and gains of blacks at the expense of whites. Parties to the debate argue as if they were concerned with harm to children or the family or the community or the nation. But, as is the case with symbolic issues, they shout past one another because the debate is really over whose values will dominate public life and whose group will receive the

concommitant public respect. To the extent that a busing policy is officially supported by the courts, the school system and other branches of government (even reluctantly), it symbolizes that blacks are valued enough by the government and other institutions of society to make the costs of time, effort and money worthwhile. Both blacks and whites know this instinctively.

What, then, can be done to defuse the conflict?

Obviously, one thing that will not be effective is to call busing opponents symbolic racists. Most do not think they are any sort of racist now and showing them a great deal of data and the analyses of a social scientist or two will not cause them either to accept their beliefs as racist or to change their minds about busing.

Much more effective would be to push ahead with busing where it is necessary and at the same time deal constructively with the symbolic needs of whites. Actions and words by court, school and public officials showing that whites' values and needs are officially recognized will symbolize to whites that they are also respected. One approach might be to institute highly visable programs designed to make the school system attractive to white parents and students. These might include drama classes, college preparatory programs, additional vocational training programs and soccer and tennis teams. All of these programs would be open to all students, of course, and not only whites are concerned about having these programs in the schools. However, if they are clearly labeled as attempts to keep whites in the school system while desegregating through busing, they will both make the system more attractive to white parents and symbolize to white parents and nonparents that the school system cares about whites as well as blacks.

The specific actions and programs designed to meet the symbolic needs of whites will test our ingenuity and cost dollars. On the other hand, the costs of a segregated school system and society are also great.

Footnotes

[1]This research was supported by grants from the Ford Foundation and the Louisville Foundation to Duke University, Willis D. Hawley and John B. McConahay Co-principal Investigators. Thanks are due to Sharon Wolf, Alan Marks and Jay Hull for computer programming and to Donna Livick-Moses for typing the manuscript.

[2]J.A. Michener, "Pressing Decisions". In N. Mills (Ed.) The great school bus controversy. New York: Teachers College Press, 1973. (Reprinted from The New York Times Magazine, November 26, 1972.)

[3]A. Kopkind, "Busing into Southie". Ramparts, December 1974, pp. 34-38.

[4]Michener, op. cit.; D. Brudnov, "Fear and Loathing in Boston". The National Review, 1974, 26, October 25, pp. 1228-31; N. Cousins, "Busing Reconsidered". Saturday Review, January 24, 1976, p. 4.

[5]D. Bauma & J. Hoffman, The dynamics of school integration. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Erdmans, 1968; N. Glazer, "Is Busing Necessary?" In N. Mills (Ed.) The great school bus controversy. New York: Teachers College Press, 1973. (Reprinted from Commentary, March 1972.)

[6]NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, "It's Not the Distance, It's the Niggers". In N. Mills (Ed.), The great school bus controversy. New York: Teachers College Press, 1973. (Reprinted from It's not the distance, "It's the Niggers." New York: NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc., 1972.)

[7]P.E. Converse, "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics". In D.E. Apter (Ed.), Ideology and discontent. New York: Free Press, 1964, pp. 206-261; "Public Opinion and Voting Behavior". In F.I. Greenstein and N.W. Polsby (Eds.), Handbook of political science Vol 4: Non-governmental politics. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1975; Also see J.B. McConahay & W.D. Hawley, "Is it the Buses or the Blacks? Self-Interest Versus Symbolic Racism as Predictors of Opposition to Busing in Louisville," submitted for publication in Political Psychology. Hereinafter referred to as "Buses or Blacks?"

[8]M. Edelman, Politics as symbolic action: Mass arousal and quiescence. Chicago: Markham, 1971; D.O. Sears, C.P. Hensler & L.K. Speer, "White's Opposition to Busing: Self-Interest or Symbolic Politics?" The American Political Science Review, in press.

[9]J.B. McConahay, "Symbolic Racism in America: The Issues are Different, but the Feeling Lingers On". Paper presented to the American Political Science Convention, September 1978; J.B. McConahay & J.C. Hough, Jr., "Symbolic Racism". Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32(2), 23-45; D.O. Sears & D.R. Kinder, "Racial Tensions and Voting in Los Angeles". In W.Z. Hirsch (Ed.) Los Angeles: Viability and prospects for metropolitan leadership. New York: Praeger, 1971,

(pp. 51-88); D.O. Sears & J.B. McConahay, The politics of violence: The new urban blacks and the Watts riots. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

[10]The previous studies are J. Caditz, "Dilemmas Over Racial Integration: Status Consciousness vs. Direct Threat". Sociological Inquiry, 1975, 45(4), 51-58; C.K. Jacobson, "Desegregation Rulings and Public Attitude Changes: White Resistance or Resignation?" American Journal of Sociology, 1978, 84, 698-705; A.R. Jensen, "Parent and Teacher Attitudes Toward Integration and Busing". Research Resume No. 43. Burlingame, California. California Advisory Council on Education Research. (May, 1970); J. Kelley, "The Politics of School Busing". Public Opinion Quarterly, 1974, 38, 23-39; J.A. Nicoletti & T.W. Patterson, "Attitudes Toward Busing as a Means of Desegregation". Psychological Reports, 1974, 35, 371-76; Sears, Hensler & Speer, op. cit. These have been reviewed in Buses or Blacks? op. cit.

[11]Sears, Hensler & Speer, op. cit.;

[12]M.J. Knapp & J.P. Alston, "White Parental Acceptance of Varying Degrees of School Desegregation: 1965 and 1970. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1972, 36, 585-591.

[13]Sampling and interviewing were done by the firm of Louis Harris and Associates. All interviews were face-to-face in the home and interviewer and respondent were of the same race. Sampling and other methodological details may be found in "Buses or Blacks?" op. cit.

[14]N.C. Glenn & J.L. Simmons, "Are Regional Cultural Differences Diminishing?" Public Opinion Quarterly, 1967, 31, 176-193.

[15]J.B. McConahay & W.D. Hawley, "Reactions to Busing in Louisville: Summary of Adult Opinions in 1976 and 1977." Working Paper #1178, Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs. Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, 1978. Hereinafter referred to as "Reactions to Busing."

[16]Knapp & Alston, op. cit.

[17]Kelley, op. cit.; Sears, Hensler & Speer, op. cit.

[18]In addition, 15% were "somewhat opposed." See "Reactions to Busing," op. cit.

[19]Sears & McConahay, op. cit.

[20]"Buses or Blacks?" op. cit.

[21]The Alpha coefficient was .79.

[22]As shown in Table 1, blacks in Louisville (and elsewhere) are not nearly as opposed to busing as whites and they weren't out protesting and fire-bombing. Hence, they will not be included in the analyses that follow.

[23]In most tables, both an ordinal measure of association (Gamma) and an interval level measure of association (the Pearson r) are reported. The multiple regressions are all bassed upon the r's.

[24]See the quote from James Michener at the beginning of this article.

[25]Bauma & Hoffman, op. cit.

[26]After a principle components factor analysis with varimax rotation revealed that these measures of self-interest could not be reduced to one or two factors, a stepwise, best predictor criterion ordinary least squares multiple regression was performed. This is the standard procedure when the investigator does not have a strong a priori theory to guide the order in which the variables are entered into the equation. The final or best equation reported in Table 2 met the following criteria. First, the highest correlate of anti-busing attitudes entered the equation and then the variable having the highest partial correlation (with the first variable controlled for) entered the equation and so forth. Second, all included variables had statistically significant effects ($p < .05$, 2 tailed). Third, any other variables added to the equation did not increase the total equation's predictive power (R^2) by at least one percent. See N.R. Draper & H. Smith, Applied regression analysis. New York: Wiley, 1966.

[27]The Beta Weight or standardized Regression coefficient is an estimate of the change in standard deviation units in the dependent variable, busing, associated with a one standard deviation change in any independent variable. Hence, the relative absolute magnitude of the Betas give an estimate of the relative effect of various independent variables, with other variables in the equation controlled. See N.H. Nie, C.H. Hull, J.G. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner & D.H. Bent, Statistical package for the social sciences, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975, p. 235.

[28]N. Day, "Busing: A Symposium". Ramparts, December 1974, pp. 40-42; Kopkind, op. cit.; J. Holt, "Busing: A Symposium". Ramparts, December 1974, p. 40.

[29]Brudnov, op. cit. See also Glazer, op. cit.

[30]A one way analysis of variance on the strength of opposition to busing scale also showed no significant linear or non-linear effect for type of school attended. $F = 1.14$; d.f. = 2, 276; $p > .30$.

[31]$F = .02$; d.f. = 2, 228; $p > .95$.

[32]Day, op. cit., p. 40.

[33]R. Middleton, "Regional Differences in Prejudice". American Sociological Review, 1976, 41, 94-117; Sears & McConahay, op. cit.

[34]One additional class of measures that combines elements of both social location and socialization is religion. It proved to have little effect upon anti-busing attitudes in Louisville. The respondents' estimate of religion's current

importance in their lives, their denomination (or lack thereof), and their frequency of attendance at church or religious services were very weakly related to the Strength of Opposition to Busing scale and when our scale of conventional religious beliefs, a measure of the extent to which people endorse the secularized residues of early American Protestantism (see McConahay & Hough, op. cit.), entered the regression equation, all other religious correlates became non-significant. Hence, the R^2 for religion was only .03 and all of that was due to the scale of Conventional Religious Beliefs.

[35]Sears, Hensler & Speer, op. cit.

[36]Glazer, op. cit.

[37]Brudnov, op. cit.

[38]This may not have been a good item for assessing laissez-faire opinion in this context. In our 1977 wave we had three additional questions to give the laissez-faire hypothesis a better test.

[39]The "safe streest" item has strong racial overtones, see Footnote 49 below and Sears & Kinder, op. cit. The racial aspect of the death penalty is well known, see J.B. McConahay, C.J. Mullin & J. Frederick, "The Uses of Social Science in Trials with Political and Racial Overtones: The Case of Joan Little," Law and Contemporary Problems, 1977, 41, 205-229. In Louisville in 1976, 76% of the whites favored the death penalty while 70% of the blacks opposed it. In 1977, these percentages 77 and 65, respectively. See "Reactions to Busing" op. cit.

[40]J.B. McConahay, S. Wolf & A. Marks, "Relative Deprivation and Equity in Anti-busing attitudes and behavior," paper in preparation.

[41]McConahay, op. cit; McConahay & Hough, op. cit.; Seats & Kinder, op. cit.

[42]The Old Fashioned Racism scale had an Alpha coefficient of .74 which is an acceptable level of reliability. For the details of scale contruction and the specific item, see "Buses or Blacks?", op. cit.

[43]The Alpha Coefficient for the Symbolic Racism Scale was .76. For the exact wording of the items and the details of scale construction, see "Buses or Blacks?" op. cit.

[44]The scale was trichotomized so that low was one standard deviation or more below the mean, moderate was between one standard deviation below and above the mean and high was one or more standard deviation above the mean.

[45]For the details of the scale and its administration, see A. Campbell, White attitudes toward black people. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1971; Also see S.E. Bennett, "On the Existence of an Underlying 'Vertical Structure' in Whites' Racial Attitudes". Social Science Quarterly, 1972, 53, 583-589; McConahay, op. cit.

[46]For a more rigorous test of the relative strengths of symbolic and old fashioned racism, see "Buses or Blacks?" op. cit.

[47]T.W. Adorno, E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D.J. Levinson & R.N. Sanford, The authoritatian personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

[48]For details see McConahay, Wolf & Marks, op. cit.

[49]D.L. Hamilton & G.D. Bishop, "Attitudinal and Behavioral Effects of Initial Integration of White Suburban Neighborhoods". Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32(2), 47-67; Sears & Kinder, op. cit.

[50]"Buses or Blacks?" op. cit.

[51]Two potential controls could not be entered into the equation because of multicollinearity with variables already in the equation as controls. See Nie etal, op. cit.

[52]In the Louisville survey, the correlation between the feeling thermometer and symbolic racism was -.38 and the correlation of the feeling thermometer with old fashioned racism was -.39. Thus, the better whites felt about blacks in general, the lower their old fashioned and symbolic racism scores and the magnitude of the two relationships between feeling and racism was virtually itentical.

[53]McConahay, op. cit.

Table 1

Opinions with Regard to Segregation and Busing in Louisville and Jefferson County (1976 Adult Sample)

Item	White (N=879)	Blacks (N=170)
"Generally speaking, do you favor full racial integration, integration in some areas of life, or separation of the races." (% Separation)	16%	1%
"In principle, do you think that it is a good idea or a bad idea for children to go to schools that have about the same proportion of blacks and whites as generally exists in the Louisville-Jefferson County area?" (% Good Idea)	51%	90%
"To what extent do you favor or oppose busing to achieve racial desegregation as it has been put into effect here in Louisville and Jefferson County? Do you strongly favor it, somewhat favor it, somewhat oppose it or strongly oppose it?" (% Strongly Opposed)	76%	13%
"Are you opposed to busing to achieve racial desegregation in all cases...or could you foresee a situation in which some type of busing program might be an acceptable means for achieving racial desegregation in the schools in Louisville and Jefferson County?" (% Opposed in All Cases)	53%	9%
"Assume that the current busing plan to achieve racial desegregation is continued again next school year, which statement on this card best describes what action you are likely to take yourself?" (% Protest and Demonstrate Against Busing)	20%	5%

Table 2

Strength of Opposition to Busing

as a Function of Measures of Self-Interest

Measures of Self-Interest	Gamma	r	Beta
Children in Public, Private or Parochial Schools (No Children=0, At Least One Child=1)	.18	.11	.11*
Rating of Meighborhood Schools Relative to Other City Schools (Better=High)	-.08	-.08	-.09*
Length of Residence in Neighborhood	.05	.08	.08
Home Ownership (Rent=0, Own=1)	.09	.09	
General Happiness with Neighborhood (Very Happy=High)	-.12	-.06	
Number of Relatives in Neighborhood	.12	.04	
Likelihood of Moving in Next 12 Months	.12	.01	
Perceived Social Importance of Neighborhood School	.01	.00	

R^2 of Best Equation*=.03, $F(3, 840)=7.67$, $p < .01$

R^2 for All Measures=.03, $F(8, 835)=3.78$, $p < .01$

*Only the Betas from the Best Equation are reported. See text and footnote X for definition of Best Equation

Table 3

Strength of Opposition to Busing as a Function of Measures of Self Interest Among Parents. (Whites Only, N=267)

Measure of Self Interest	r	Beta[a]
Likelihood of Moving in Next 12 Months	.15*	.13
Rating of Neighborhood Schools Relative to Other City Schools (Better=High)	-.14*	-.12
Type of School Attended by Children in Family (All in Private=1, Some in Private and Some in Public=2, All in Public=3)	.04	
Extent of Busing in Family (None Bused=1, Some Bused and Some Not=2, All Bused=3)	.00	
Proportion of Children to be Bused in the Future (None=1, Some, But Not All=2, All=3)	-.08	
Age of Oldest Child in School	-.11*	
Grade of Oldest Child	-.10	
Number of Relatives in Neighborhood	.05	
General Happiness with Neighborhood	-.08	
Length of Residence in Neighborhood	-.05	
Number of Children in School	-.03	
Number of Children in Public Schools	.00	
Number of Girls in School	-.03	
Number of Boys in School	-.01	
Perceived Social Importance of Neighborhood School	-.03	

R^2 of Best Equation[a]=.04, $F(2, 264)=4.97$, $p < .01$

R^2 for All Measures=.06, $F(15, 251)=.96$, N.S.

*$p < .05$, one tailed

[a]Only the Betas from the Best Equation are reported. See text for definition of Best Equation

Table 4

Strength of Opposition to Busing

as a Function of Measures of Current Social Location

(Whites Only, N=698)

Measures of Current Social Location	Gamma	r	Beta
Occupation of head of household (Blue Collar=0, White Collar=1)	-.29	-.20	-.13*
Do you own your own home here, or do you rent? (Rent=0, Own=1)	.09	.08	.13*
Total Family Income for 1975	-.13	-.11	-.14*
Are you currently a member of a labor union, or is anyone here in the household a member? (No Union Member=0, At Least One=1)	.27	.16	.10*
Respondent's sex is (Male=0, Female=1)	-.10	-.07	-.08*
Unemployment (Retired, Employed, Housewife, etc.=0, Unemployed=1)	.15	.05	
Employed (Unemployed, Retired, Housewife, etc.=0, Employed=1)	.05	.01	

R^2 of Best Equation*+.07, $F(5, 692)=10.95$, $p < .001$

R^2 for All Measures=.08, $F(7, 690)=8.04$, $p < .001$

*Only the Betas from the Best Equation are reported. See text for definition of Best Equation.

Table 5

Strength of Opposition to Busing as a Function of Measures of Socialization and Perceived Social Status (Whites Only, N=715)

Measure of Socialization and Perceived Social Status	Gamma	r	Beta
Education	-.24	-.25	-.23*
What is the name of the community you lived in the longest up until the time you were 13 years of age? (South=0, North=1)	-.31	-.14	-.10*
What is the name of the community you lived in the longest between the ages of 13 and 18? (South=0, North=1)	-.19	-.08	
Age	.07	.09	
Importance of religion as a child (Most Important Thing in My Life=High)	.08	.08	
What type of work did your father mainly do while you were growing up? (Blue Collar=0, White Collar=1)	-.25	-.15	
How many years have you lived in Louisville or Jefferson County?	.08	.12	
Subjective Social Class	-.19	-.10	

R^2 of Best Equation*=.07, F(2, 712=28.16, p <..001

R^2 for All Measures=.09, F(7, 707)=9.81, p < .01

*Only the Betas from the Best Equation are reported. See text for definition of Best Equation.

Table 6

Strength of Opposition to Busing
as a Function of Measures of Political Attitudes
(Whites Only, N=781)

Measures of Political Attitudes[a]	Gamma	r	Beta
Streets aren't safe these days without a policeman around	.22	.21	.16*
People like me don't have any say about what the government does	.24	.21	.16*
Sex education classes should be taught in the Louisville and Jefferson County schools	-.21	-.18	-.14*
I favor the death penalty for persons convicted of murder	.14	.14	.12*
Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn	.22	.19	
It is up to the government to make sure that everyone has a secure job and a good standard of living	-.03	-.01	
What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith	.15	.13	
Strength of Democratic Party Affiliation (Very Strong Republican=1, Very Strong Democrat=7)	-.06	-.06	

R^2 of Best Equation*=.11, $F(4, 776)=23.99$, $p < .001$

R^2 for All Measures=.12, $F(8, 772)=12.47$, $p < .001$

[a]All but Party Affiliation are Likert type items ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5)

*Only the Betas from the Best Equation are reported. See text for definition of Best Equation.

Table 7

Strength of Opposition to Busing
as a Function of Measures of Racial Attitudes
(Whites Only, N=597)

Measures of Racial Attitudes	Gamma	r	Beta
Symbolic Racism	.56	.51	.51*
Old Fashioned Racism	.37	.36	
Feeling Thermometer for Blacks[a] (Warm or Favorable=High)	-.19	-.16	
Have any blacks visited socially in your home, or have you visited socially in any black homes in the last month or so? (Yes=1, No=0)	-.06	-.05	
Frequency of Any Contact with Blacks (Almost Every Day=High)	.01	.00	

R^2 of Best Equation*=.26, $F(1, 596)=207.63$, $p < .001$

R^2 for All Measures=.27, $F(5, 592)=44.63$, $p < .001$

*Only the Betas from the Best Equation are reported. See text for definition of Best Equation.

[a]See text for details

Table 8

Best Stepwise Multiple Regression Equation for Predicting Strength of Opposition to Busing (Whites Only, N=563)

Predictor Variable (In Order Entering Equation)	Beta for Best Equation	Beta with 21 Control Variables
Symbolic Racism	.44***	.39***
Satisfaction with Personal Influence on School Desegregation Decisions	-.13***	-.22**
Southern Socialization	.10**	.09*
Blue Collar Head of Household	.10**	.07
Crime in the Streets Ideology	.08*	.09*
R^2	.31	.34
F	49.72***	10.93***
d.f.	5, 557	25, 537

*F ratio significant at $p < .05$
**F ratio significant at $p < .01$
***F ratio significant at $p < .001$